

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICHARD A. EVANS,

Plaintiff,

V.

R. MILAM, *et al.*

## Defendants.

Case No. 1:20-cv-00070-JDP

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO  
DENY MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA  
PAUPERIS AND REQUIRE PAYMENT OF  
FILING FEE IN FULL WITHIN TWENTY-  
ONE DAYS

ECF No. 2

## OBJECTIONS DUE WITHIN 14 DAYS

ORDER TO ASSIGN CASE TO DISTRICT  
JUDGE

Plaintiff Richard A. Evans is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in this civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2020, plaintiff filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. ECF No. 2.

The Prison Litigation Reform Act provides that “[i]n no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action . . . under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff has had three or more actions dismissed as frivolous, as malicious, or

1 for failing to state a claim upon which relief maybe granted.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has been informed on  
2 previous occasions that he is subject to § 1915(g).<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff has also not satisfied the imminent  
3 danger exception to § 1915(g). *See Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493 F.3d 1047, 1053-55 (9th Cir.  
4 2007). Plaintiff's cursory allegations about leaking and flooding do not show that he was in any  
5 imminent, personal danger at the time of filing, and do not describe any actions of the defendants  
6 or connect any of the defendants to the alleged harm.

7 Accordingly, plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* applications should be denied, and he should  
8 pay the filing fee in full, since he has accrued three or more strikes and has not shown that he was  
9 under imminent danger of serious physical harm at the time that this action was initiated.

10 **Order**

11 The clerk of court is directed to assign this case to a district judge who will review the  
12 findings and recommendations.

13 **Findings and Recommendations**

14 Based on the foregoing, it is hereby recommended that:

15 1. plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* application, ECF No. 2, be denied;

16 2. plaintiff be required to pay the \$400 filing fee in full within twenty-one days of adoption  
17 of these findings and recommendations; and

18 3. if plaintiff fails to pay the \$400 filing fee in full within twenty-one days of adoption of  
19 these findings and recommendations, all pending motions be terminated, and this action  
20 be dismissed without prejudice.

21 We submit these findings and recommendations to a district judge under 28 U.S.C. §  
22 636(b)(1)(B) and Rule 304 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court,  
23

---

24 <sup>1</sup> The cases include (1) *Evans v. Cal. Dep't of Corr. & Rehab.*, No. 2:17-cv-01891-JAM-KJN (E.D.  
25 Cal. 2018) (dismissed for failure to prosecute following a screening order finding that the complaint  
26 failed to state a claim); (2) *Evans v. Cal. Dep't of Corr. & Rehab.*, No. 2:17-cv-01890-WBS-DB  
27 (E.D. Cal. 2018) (dismissed for failure to prosecute following a screening order finding that the  
complaint failed to state a claim); and (3) *Evans v. Suisun Police Dep't*, No. 2:17-cv-01889-KJM-  
CMK (E.D. Cal. 2018) (dismissed in 2018 for failure to state a claim).

28 <sup>2</sup> *See Evans v. Siebel, et al.*, No. 1:19-cv-00819-LJO-SAB (E.D. Cal. 2019); *Evans v. Sherman, et  
al.*, No. 1:19-cv-00818-LJO-BAM (E.D. Cal. 2019).

1      Eastern District of California. Within fourteen days of the service of the findings and  
2      recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections to the findings and recommendations with  
3      the court and serve a copy on all parties. That document should be captioned "Objections to  
4      Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The district judge will review the findings  
5      and recommendations under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

6

7      IT IS SO ORDERED.

8

9      Dated: January 25, 2020

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10

11

12      No. 205.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28